REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of certain informalities. The specification has been amended to remove the informality.

Claim Objections

Claims 34-38 are objected to because of certain informalities. These claims have been amended to remove the informalities.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 102

Claims 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chintada et al. (US 6,697,983 Bi) or "Chintada". Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every limitation of the claim. *See* MPEP §2131. As to claim 34, Chintada does not teach each and every limitation.

Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that Chintada actually requires that all data must be transferred not withstanding the predictable errors (*see* col. 1, lines 20-25) and the window size on each side cannot be updated until each and every frame/packet is received by the receiver. Because of this requirement, the transmitter and receiver run into a situation when the window buffers are full and neither the transmitter nor receiver can communicate with each other thus creating "channel idle" periods (*see* col. 2, lines 30-33). Chintada describes a method to get around "channel idle" periods by recovering lost frames using data link layer tunneling. In Chintada, the receiver does not update its window until every packet/frame has been acknowledged (*see* col. 2, lines 60-67).

TI-36920 - 8 -

In complete contrast, a clearly distinctive method is recited in claim 34. Claim 34 recites that if the second plurality of data packets does not include packets that were not received by the receiver in the first plurality of data packets, then updating the lower and upper limits of the receive packet buffer window corresponding to minimum and maximum sequence numbers respectively of packets included in the second plurality of data packets. Therefore, the receiver does not block the receive window buffer with sequence numbers of packets that were not received (or may never be received because the transmitter may have discarded them), and updates the receive window according to the new batch of packets. Chintada does not teach this limitation and accordingly, claim 34 is patentably distinguishable from Chintada.

Applicants have submitted new claims 39-47 that are patentably distinguishable from Chintada for at least the same reasons as claim 34.

Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance. Please charge any additional fees, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0668. Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, please contact the below named attorney for Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

Abdul Zindani
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,091

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5137